

Course-Section: ART 210 01
 Title Visual Concepts
 Instructor: Gardner, Symmes
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 78
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	839/1447	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	292/1447	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	514/1241	4.77	4.41	4.33	4.35	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	336/1402	4.47	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	952/1358	3.50	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	1192/1316	3.40	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	739/1427	4.16	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	619/1447	4.87	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	478/1434	4.05	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	798/1387	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	748/1386	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	549/1380	4.52	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	652/1193	4.49	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	710/1172	4.18	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	968/1182	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.30	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	440/1170	4.41	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 800	3.56	4.22	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 210 02
 Title Visual Concepts
 Instructor: Panfile,Natalia
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 79
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	909/1447	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1243/1447	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1241	4.77	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	976/1402	4.47	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	3	0	0	2.33	1344/1358	3.50	3.65	4.11	4.12	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	1	1	2.67	1288/1316	3.40	3.62	4.14	4.08	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	2	7	1	3.58	1234/1427	4.16	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.87	4.47	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	4	1	3.36	1286/1434	4.05	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	1294/1387	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.42	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1268/1387	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	2	6	1	3.42	1280/1386	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.24	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1223/1380	4.52	4.29	4.32	4.30	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	620/1193	4.49	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	904/1172	4.18	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	941/1182	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.30	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1070/1170	4.41	4.35	4.38	4.32	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	785/ 800	3.56	4.22	4.06	4.01	2.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 210 03
 Title Visual Concepts
 Instructor: Shiflet,Nicole
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 80
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	654/1447	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	389/1447	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.77	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	745/1402	4.47	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	799/1358	3.50	3.65	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	921/1316	3.40	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	410/1427	4.16	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	727/1447	4.87	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	786/1434	4.05	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1386	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	4.52	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/1193	4.49	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	710/1172	4.18	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	710/1170	4.41	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	3.56	4.22	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 210 04
 Title Visual Concepts
 Instructor: Shiflet,Nicole
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 81
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1257/1447	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.31	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	662/1447	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.77	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	347/1402	4.47	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	987/1358	3.50	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	3	3	2	3.09	1249/1316	3.40	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	971/1427	4.16	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.87	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	668/1434	4.05	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	429/1387	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	829/1387	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	431/1386	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.52	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	75/1193	4.49	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	559/1172	4.18	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	803/1182	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.41	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	423/ 800	3.56	4.22	4.06	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 12	Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	342/1447	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	489/1447	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.77	4.41	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	157/1402	4.47	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1358	3.50	3.65	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	812/1316	3.40	3.62	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	644/1427	4.16	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	727/1447	4.87	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	712/1434	4.05	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1387	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	136/1386	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.52	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	205/1193	4.49	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	124/1172	4.18	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1182	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	501/1170	4.41	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	318/ 800	3.56	4.22	4.06	4.01	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.28	4.09	3.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 02
 Title Visual Concepts II/Cam
 Instructor: Fannon, Jill K.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 83
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	276/1447	4.54	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	292/1447	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	505/1241	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	129/1402	4.63	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	761/1358	3.87	3.65	4.11	4.12	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	362/1316	3.92	3.62	4.14	4.08	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	373/1427	4.43	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	978/1447	4.78	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	105/1434	4.42	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.70	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.87	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1380	4.65	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1193	4.70	4.41	4.02	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	4.48	4.08	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.72	4.31	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.74	4.35	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	4.02	4.22	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	971/1447	4.54	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	648/1447	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1241	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	542/1402	4.63	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	952/1358	3.87	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1180/1316	3.92	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	301/1427	4.43	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	928/1447	4.78	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1031/1434	4.42	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	755/1387	4.70	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	844/1387	4.87	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	663/1386	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	775/1380	4.65	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	224/1193	4.70	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	600/1172	4.48	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	521/1182	4.72	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	480/1170	4.74	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	290/ 800	4.02	4.22	4.06	4.01	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	1	
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	375/1447	4.54	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	413/1447	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	891/1241	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.35	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	402/1402	4.63	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1063/1358	3.87	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	944/1316	3.92	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	931/1427	4.43	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.47	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	290/1434	4.42	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	429/1387	4.70	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	707/1387	4.87	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1386	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	463/1380	4.65	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	288/1193	4.70	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	593/1172	4.48	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	480/1182	4.72	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	559/1170	4.74	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	600/ 800	4.02	4.22	4.06	4.01	3.70

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 10	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 1				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	2		
				? 0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	1	5	3.31	1373/1447	3.59	4.27	4.31	4.31	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1384/1447	3.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1230/1241	3.50	4.41	4.33	4.35	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1223/1402	3.80	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1266/1358	3.09	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	0	5	1	2	2.75	1282/1316	2.91	3.62	4.14	4.08	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	2	3	1	2.67	1388/1427	3.33	3.91	4.19	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1168/1447	4.55	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1399/1434	3.20	4.04	4.10	3.97	2.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1260/1387	3.88	4.39	4.46	4.42	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	1072/1387	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1211/1386	3.67	4.27	4.32	4.24	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	1	5	3.58	1223/1380	3.67	4.29	4.32	4.30	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	843/1193	4.17	4.41	4.02	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	881/1172	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	856/1182	3.99	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	864/1170	3.98	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	780/ 800	3.55	4.22	4.06	4.01	2.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.86	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.71	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	37/ 38	2.25	2.25	4.49	2.25	2.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	32/ 36	3.25	3.25	4.25	3.25	3.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ART 212 01
 Title Visual Concepts III/3D
 Instructor: Bradley, Stephen
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 86
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 212 02
 Title Visual Concepts III/3D
 Instructor: Young, Shannon
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 87
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1339/1447	3.59	4.27	4.31	4.31	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	1350/1447	3.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1188/1241	3.50	4.41	4.33	4.35	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	1	3.40	1286/1402	3.80	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1278/1358	3.09	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1172/1316	2.91	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1291/1427	3.33	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1018/1447	4.55	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1325/1434	3.20	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1282/1387	3.88	4.39	4.46	4.42	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1300/1387	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1220/1386	3.67	4.27	4.32	4.24	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1284/1380	3.67	4.29	4.32	4.30	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	652/1193	4.17	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1067/1172	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1152/1182	3.99	4.31	4.35	4.30	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1124/1170	3.98	4.35	4.38	4.32	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 800	3.55	4.22	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 10	Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 212 03
 Title Visual Concepts III/3D
 Instructor: Faura, Joseph J.
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 88
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1277/1447	3.59	4.27	4.31	4.31	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1210/1447	3.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	900/1402	3.80	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	2	1	2	2.78	1328/1358	3.09	3.65	4.11	4.12	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1077/1427	3.33	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	928/1447	4.55	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1325/1434	3.20	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1258/1387	3.88	4.39	4.46	4.42	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	829/1387	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	2	1	3.33	1290/1386	3.67	4.27	4.32	4.24	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1169/1380	3.67	4.29	4.32	4.30	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	340/1193	4.17	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	970/1172	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	508/1182	3.99	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	864/1170	3.98	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1206/1447	3.59	4.27	4.31	4.31	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1228/1447	3.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	541/1241	3.50	4.41	4.33	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	923/1402	3.80	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1244/1358	3.09	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1295/1316	2.91	3.62	4.14	4.08	2.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	5	2	2	3.36	1303/1427	3.33	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1079/1447	4.55	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	1052/1434	3.20	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1000/1387	3.88	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1072/1387	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1047/1386	3.67	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1030/1380	3.67	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	288/1193	4.17	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	619/1172	3.68	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	490/1182	3.99	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1170	3.98	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	195/ 800	3.55	4.22	4.06	4.01	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 213 01
 Title Visual Concepts IV/4D
 Instructor: Valiente,Christ
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 90
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	585/1447	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	447/1447	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1241	4.63	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	836/1402	4.32	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1231/1358	3.93	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1172/1316	3.77	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	931/1427	3.94	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1419/1447	4.24	4.47	4.69	4.70	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	503/1434	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	850/1387	4.52	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	863/1386	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	868/1380	4.33	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	149/1193	4.66	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	559/1172	4.31	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	621/1182	4.47	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	640/1170	4.56	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	4.26	4.22	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 02
 Title Visual Concepts IV/4D
 Instructor: Moren,Lisa
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 91
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	342/1447	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	604/1447	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	427/1241	4.63	4.41	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	93/1402	4.32	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	529/1358	3.93	3.65	4.11	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	700/1316	3.77	3.62	4.14	4.08	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	850/1427	3.94	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1291/1447	4.24	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1117/1434	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.71

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	521/1387	4.52	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	829/1387	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	558/1386	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	659/1380	4.33	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	131/1193	4.66	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.75

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.31	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.47	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.56	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	562/ 800	4.26	4.22	4.06	4.01	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 8	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: ART 213 03
 Title Visual Concepts IV/4D
 Instructor: Mayhew, James
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 92
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	909/1447	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	956/1447	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	4.63	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	807/1402	4.32	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1152/1358	3.93	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1134/1316	3.77	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1180/1427	3.94	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	901/1447	4.24	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	983/1434	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	941/1387	4.52	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	863/1386	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	940/1380	4.33	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	205/1193	4.66	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	801/1172	4.31	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	941/1182	4.47	4.31	4.35	4.30	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	687/1170	4.56	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	169/ 800	4.26	4.22	4.06	4.01	4.57
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	Under-grad 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 0

Course-Section: ART 213 04
 Title Visual Concepts IV/4D
 Instructor: Moren,Lisa
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 93
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	695/1447	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	1011/1447	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1241	4.63	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	976/1402	4.32	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1358	3.93	3.65	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	812/1316	3.77	3.62	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1160/1427	3.94	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1223/1447	4.24	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	996/1434	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	741/1387	4.52	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	707/1387	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	733/1386	4.38	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	262/1193	4.66	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	619/1172	4.31	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	400/1182	4.47	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	522/1170	4.56	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	250/ 800	4.26	4.22	4.06	4.01	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 10	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: ART 214 01
 Title Drawing I
 Instructor: Chan,Irene
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 94
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	5	2	3.14	1396/1447	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.31	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	1	2	2.85	1415/1447	3.87	4.23	4.27	4.23	2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	6	3	1	2.92	1370/1402	3.88	4.21	4.24	4.24	2.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1203/1358	3.16	3.65	4.11	4.12	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	1	2	1	1	2.20	1307/1316	2.20	3.62	4.14	4.08	2.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1271/1427	3.42	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	1060/1447	4.52	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	3	4	5	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.87	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1298/1387	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.42	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	1306/1387	4.62	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	4	5	1	3.25	1299/1386	3.99	4.27	4.32	4.24	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1267/1380	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.30	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	0	4	1	2	2.90	1117/1193	3.70	4.41	4.02	4.04	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1050/1172	3.60	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	767/1182	4.50	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	798/1170	4.47	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	655/ 800	4.13	4.22	4.06	4.01	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.86	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.71	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.28	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors		8
			General		0
			Electives		2
			Other		1
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			Graduate	0	Major
			Under-grad	14	Non-major
					5

Course-Section: ART 214 02
 Title Drawing I
 Instructor: Nohe, Timothy
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 95
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	507/1447	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	648/1447	3.87	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	567/1402	3.88	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1319/1358	3.16	3.65	4.11	4.12	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	4	1	3.29	1325/1427	3.42	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	819/1447	4.52	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	578/1434	3.87	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	798/1387	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.62	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	483/1386	3.99	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	520/1380	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1193	3.70	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1172	3.60	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.50	4.31	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.47	4.35	4.38	4.32	5.00
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 214 03
 Title Drawing I
 Instructor: Kissack,Lyle
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 96
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	408/1447	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	766/1447	3.87	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	745/1402	3.88	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1316	2.20	3.62	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1259/1427	3.42	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1252/1447	4.52	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	578/1434	3.87	4.04	4.10	3.97	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1000/1387	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	528/1387	4.62	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1006/1386	3.99	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	840/1380	4.11	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	999/1193	3.70	4.41	4.02	4.04	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	801/1172	3.60	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	714/1182	4.50	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	798/1170	4.47	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.13	4.22	4.06	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 220 01
 Title Art History I
 Instructor: Feldman,Joan S
 Enrollment: 123
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 97
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	6	26	29	4.13	980/1447	4.13	4.27	4.31	4.31	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	24	36	4.42	662/1447	4.42	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	15	41	4.43	622/1241	4.43	4.41	4.33	4.35	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	13	20	25	4.05	949/1402	4.05	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	3	8	21	26	4.15	700/1358	4.15	3.65	4.11	4.12	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	3	17	20	21	3.87	927/1316	3.87	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	9	22	31	4.20	842/1427	4.20	3.91	4.19	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	2	4	59	4.82	727/1447	4.82	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	3	9	28	15	3.95	929/1434	3.95	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	16	45	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	10	55	4.78	829/1387	4.78	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	7	17	39	4.43	705/1386	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	15	43	4.54	626/1380	4.54	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	10	16	35	4.23	493/1193	4.23	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	2	1	6	7	10	3.85	835/1172	3.85	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	2	1	4	7	12	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.31	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	0	1	7	3	14	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.35	4.38	4.32	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	41	22	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.86	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.71	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.28	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ART 220 01
 Title Art History I
 Instructor: Feldman,Joan S
 Enrollment: 123
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 97
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	43	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	9	C	4	General	23	Under-grad	67	Non-major	36
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	4	17	27	22	3.96	1108/1447	3.96	4.27	4.31	4.31	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	28	23	13	3.59	1293/1447	3.59	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	15	27	22	3.91	982/1241	3.91	4.41	4.33	4.35	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	2	5	16	24	17	3.77	1158/1402	3.77	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	3	8	25	28	4.07	761/1358	4.07	3.65	4.11	4.12	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	5	18	21	21	3.72	1014/1316	3.72	3.62	4.14	4.08	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	9	8	22	29	3.96	1024/1427	3.96	3.91	4.19	4.14	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	11	58	4.81	727/1447	4.81	4.47	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	1	17	32	3	3.65	1162/1434	3.65	4.04	4.10	3.97	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	2	15	49	4.63	611/1387	4.63	4.39	4.46	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	7	60	4.87	630/1387	4.87	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	5	12	24	27	4.07	1018/1386	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.24	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	7	20	36	4.28	858/1380	4.28	4.29	4.32	4.30	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	3	7	15	37	4.28	455/1193	4.28	4.41	4.02	4.04	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	12	3	8	7	8	2.89	1120/1172	2.89	4.08	4.15	4.12	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	7	6	11	6	8	3.05	1137/1182	3.05	4.31	4.35	4.30	3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	5	5	15	5	8	3.16	1129/1170	3.16	4.35	4.38	4.32	3.16
4. Were special techniques successful	33	29	2	2	1	1	4	3.30	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 62	****	4.86	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.71	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.28	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A 26	Required for Majors 35	Graduate 0	Major 26
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 21	General 24	Under-grad 72	Non-major 46
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C 14			
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F 0			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	2			

Course-Section: ART 305 01
 Title Film I: Moving Images
 Instructor: Valiente,Christ
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 99
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	401/1447	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1139/1402	3.80	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	608/1358	4.25	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1235/1316	3.20	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	898/1427	4.13	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1419/1447	3.75	4.47	4.69	4.65	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	931/1387	4.38	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	887/1380	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.60	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	522/1170	4.60	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.22	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 314 01
 Title Drawing II
 Instructor: Chan,Irene
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 100
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1159/1447	3.91	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	999/1447	4.09	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	745/1402	4.27	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1358	****	3.65	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	0	4	0	2.44	1302/1316	2.44	3.62	4.14	4.13	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	914/1427	4.10	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1015/1387	4.29	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	855/1386	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	555/1193	4.17	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	619/1172	4.20	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	657/1170	4.40	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 11	Non-major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1369/1447	3.33	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1361/1447	3.33	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1166/1241	3.40	4.41	4.33	4.33	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1163/1402	3.75	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1339/1358	2.50	3.65	4.11	4.10	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	1313/1316	1.83	3.62	4.14	4.13	1.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	0	2	0	2.17	1414/1427	2.17	3.91	4.19	4.15	2.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1331/1434	3.17	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1362/1387	2.80	4.39	4.46	4.44	2.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1203/1387	4.40	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1363/1386	2.60	4.27	4.32	4.30	2.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1351/1380	2.60	4.29	4.32	4.32	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1130/1193	2.80	4.41	4.02	4.05	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.31	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.86	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.71	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.28	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 315 01
 Title Video I
 Instructor: Grabill, Vincent
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 101
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 321 01
 Title 19Th Century Art
 Instructor: Smalls,James
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 102
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	648/1447	4.43	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	392/1241	4.65	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1188/1402	3.71	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	9	5	3.71	1050/1358	3.71	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	6	3	5	3.05	1253/1316	3.05	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	7	6	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	13	5	4.10	1334/1447	4.10	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	600/1434	4.29	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	649/1386	4.48	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	159/1380	4.90	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	224/1193	4.60	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	0	0	4	2	2.82	1129/1172	2.82	4.08	4.15	4.24	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	5	0	3	1	2	2.55	1171/1182	2.55	4.31	4.35	4.42	2.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	1	2	1	3	2.82	1150/1170	2.82	4.35	4.38	4.49	2.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ART 323 01
 Title 20Th Century Art
 Instructor: Smalls,James
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 103
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	6	3	3	3.00	1411/1447	3.71	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	4	4	3.28	1370/1447	3.92	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1068/1241	4.18	4.41	4.33	4.33	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	5	3	4	2	2	2.56	1390/1402	3.34	4.21	4.24	4.24	2.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	2	2	3	1	2.06	1351/1358	3.19	3.65	4.11	4.10	2.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	9	2	5	1	1	2.06	1309/1316	2.98	3.62	4.14	4.13	2.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	5	4	3	3.11	1356/1427	3.57	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	6	1	3	2	6	3.06	1442/1447	3.54	4.47	4.69	4.65	3.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	6	2	7	2	1	2.44	1410/1434	3.45	4.04	4.10	4.09	2.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	1160/1387	4.46	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	1289/1387	4.58	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	9	3	3	3.28	1296/1386	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.30	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1074/1380	4.36	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	1	2	5	6	3.59	933/1193	4.18	4.41	4.02	4.05	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	1	2	0	2.00	1165/1172	3.00	4.08	4.15	4.24	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1094/1182	3.90	4.31	4.35	4.42	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	1	2	1	2	2.78	1152/1170	3.84	4.35	4.38	4.49	2.78

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ART 323 02
 Title 20Th Century Art
 Instructor: Jacob, Preminda
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 104
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	10	18	4.42	709/1447	3.71	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	19	4.57	468/1447	3.92	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	439/1241	4.18	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	3	11	11	4.11	900/1402	3.34	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	18	4.32	540/1358	3.19	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	8	7	12	3.90	910/1316	2.98	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	7	14	4.03	953/1427	3.57	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	2	6	11	11	4.03	1352/1447	3.54	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	397/1434	3.45	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	245/1387	4.46	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1387	4.58	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	253/1386	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	27	4.77	312/1380	4.36	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	118/1193	4.18	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	3	6	9	4.00	710/1172	3.00	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	676/1182	3.90	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	223/1170	3.84	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors		25	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General		1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ART 325 01
 Title Hist Of Film & Video
 Instructor: Sturgeon,John
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 105
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	1	6	10	14	3.75	1257/1447	3.75	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	6	9	12	3.53	1315/1447	3.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	5	4	5	17	3.74	1071/1241	3.74	4.41	4.33	4.33	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	3	2	0	3	5	3.38	1292/1402	3.38	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	6	1	5	6	16	3.74	1036/1358	3.74	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	4	1	1	4	5	3.33	1200/1316	3.33	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	2	4	9	17	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	436/1447	4.91	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	4	2	7	14	3	3.33	1293/1434	3.33	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	1	4	25	4.38	921/1387	4.38	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	3	29	4.74	889/1387	4.74	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	1	2	6	20	4.12	988/1386	4.12	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	5	22	4.26	877/1380	4.26	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	2	1	0	29	4.64	205/1193	4.64	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	9	0	2	5	3	2.63	1153/1172	2.63	4.08	4.15	4.24	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	9	2	1	3	3	2.39	1174/1182	2.39	4.31	4.35	4.42	2.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	6	3	2	2	4	2.71	1156/1170	2.71	4.35	4.38	4.49	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	18	13	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 37	Non-major 21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 19	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ART 327 01
 Title Cont Directions in Pho
 Instructor: Durant,Mark R
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 106
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	12	17	4.31	810/1447	4.31	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	8	21	4.43	648/1447	4.43	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	448/1402	4.55	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	24	4.51	338/1358	4.51	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	322/1316	4.57	3.62	4.14	4.13	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	11	5	15	4.03	953/1427	4.03	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	230/1387	4.88	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	159/1387	4.97	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	229/1386	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	406/1380	4.71	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	75/1193	4.87	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	366/1172	4.52	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	23	4.84	261/1182	4.84	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	89/1170	4.96	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 29	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 35 Non-major 12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 331 01
 Title Graph Des I: Image, Si
 Instructor: Coates, Joseph M
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 107
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1280/1447	3.54	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1353/1447	3.19	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	5	1	3	3.17	1347/1402	3.13	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	1325/1358	2.61	3.65	4.11	4.10	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1316	2.75	3.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	2	3	1	2.62	1395/1427	2.52	3.91	4.19	4.15	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1252/1447	4.25	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1349/1434	2.95	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	4	4	3.75	1262/1387	3.31	4.39	4.46	4.44	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1042/1387	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1191/1386	3.19	4.27	4.32	4.30	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1223/1380	3.29	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	960/1193	3.33	4.41	4.02	4.05	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	812/1172	3.32	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	952/1182	3.76	4.31	4.35	4.42	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	781/1170	3.92	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	1	5	3	3.38	1363/1447	3.54	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	4	2	3.00	1400/1447	3.19	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1354/1402	3.13	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1342/1358	2.61	3.65	4.11	4.10	2.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1282/1316	2.75	3.62	4.14	4.13	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	3	2	1	2.42	1402/1427	2.52	3.91	4.19	4.15	2.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1252/1447	4.25	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	4	2	1	2.90	1381/1434	2.95	4.04	4.10	4.09	2.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	1359/1387	3.31	4.39	4.46	4.44	2.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1214/1387	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	1	2	0	2	2.63	1361/1386	3.19	4.27	4.32	4.30	2.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	1317/1380	3.29	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1060/1193	3.33	4.41	4.02	4.05	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1138/1172	3.32	4.08	4.15	4.24	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1047/1182	3.76	4.31	4.35	4.42	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1025/1170	3.92	4.35	4.38	4.49	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.79	4.58	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	
				P 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	0
?	0		

Course-Section: ART 332 01
 Title Design & Tech I: Print
 Instructor: Rosenberg,Ari
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 109
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	375/1447	4.63	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.76	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	616/1402	4.38	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	799/1358	3.82	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	3.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1090/1427	3.81	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1286/1447	4.21	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	309/1434	4.43	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.78	4.39	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1386	4.78	4.27	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1380	4.83	4.29	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	256/1193	4.58	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	580/1172	3.93	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	856/1182	3.93	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	864/1170	3.97	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 332 02
 Title Design & Tech I: Print
 Instructor: Rosenberg,Ari
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 110
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	529/1447	4.63	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	413/1447	4.76	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	665/1402	4.38	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	3	1	5	3.64	1104/1358	3.82	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	3.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	8	3.72	1176/1427	3.81	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1269/1447	4.21	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	565/1434	4.43	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	727/1387	4.78	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.92	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	558/1386	4.78	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	463/1380	4.83	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	217/1193	4.58	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	958/1172	3.93	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	963/1182	3.93	4.31	4.35	4.42	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	3	8	3.93	917/1170	3.97	4.35	4.38	4.49	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 333 01
 Title Typograpy I
 Instructor: Campbell,Susan
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 111
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1447	4.62	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.91	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	231/1241	4.82	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	93/1402	4.91	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	137/1358	4.58	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.63	3.62	4.14	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	459/1427	4.37	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1124/1447	4.53	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	4.61	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.81	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	982/1387	4.75	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.76	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.73	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	555/1193	4.33	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	247/1172	4.73	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.74	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.62	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	86/ 800	4.85	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 8	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: ART 333 02
 Title Typograpy I
 Instructor: Campbell,Susan
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 112
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	430/1447	4.62	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	89/1447	4.91	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1241	4.82	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	74/1402	4.91	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	507/1358	4.58	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	292/1316	4.63	3.62	4.14	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	799/1427	4.37	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1008/1447	4.53	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	270/1434	4.61	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	307/1387	4.81	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	707/1387	4.75	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	316/1386	4.76	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	463/1380	4.73	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	288/1193	4.33	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1172	4.73	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	470/1182	4.74	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	679/1170	4.62	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	84/ 800	4.85	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	13	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 334 02
 Title Graphic Design IV
 Instructor: Bell, Kathryn L
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 113
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	186/1402	4.79	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	****	3.65	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1316	****	3.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	716/1427	4.31	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1340/1447	4.08	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	490/1387	4.71	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	278/1386	4.79	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	491/1380	4.64	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	195/1172	4.79	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	382/1182	4.71	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

Course-Section: ART 336 01
 Title Design & Tech II: Scre
 Instructor: Bell, Kathryn L
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 114
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	899/1447	4.54	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	619/1447	4.58	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	758/1241	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	797/1402	4.61	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1251/1358	3.75	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	950/1316	4.22	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1427	4.31	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.29	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	849/1434	4.40	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1039/1387	4.63	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1143/1387	4.75	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1141/1386	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1030/1380	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	358/1193	4.71	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.43

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	841/1172	4.22	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	979/1182	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.42	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	576/1170	4.65	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	742/ 800	4.00	4.22	4.06	4.12	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 336 02
 Title Design & Tech II: Scre
 Instructor: Bell, Kathryn L
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 115
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.54	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.58	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1402	4.61	4.21	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	608/1358	3.75	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	292/1316	4.22	3.62	4.14	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	739/1427	4.31	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1036/1447	4.29	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.40	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.63	4.39	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.75	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1386	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1193	4.71	4.41	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.22	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	4.42	4.31	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.65	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	4.00	4.22	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 7	Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 341 01
 Title Intro To Animation
 Instructor: Dyer, Eric
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 116
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	853/1447	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1175/1241	3.92	4.41	4.33	4.33	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	923/1402	4.31	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1104/1358	3.68	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	1292/1316	3.11	3.62	4.14	4.13	2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1176/1427	3.78	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1054/1447	4.23	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	786/1434	4.22	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	684/1387	4.66	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.91	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	529/1386	4.56	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1003/1380	4.36	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	131/1193	4.83	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	675/1172	4.15	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	727/1182	4.34	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	554/1170	4.37	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	769/ 800	3.67	4.22	4.06	4.12	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.28	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	3.81	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 341 02
 Title Intro To Animation
 Instructor: Dyer,Eric
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 117
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	532/1447	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	541/1241	3.92	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	448/1402	4.31	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1043/1358	3.68	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1088/1316	3.11	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1123/1427	3.78	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	1400/1447	4.23	4.47	4.69	4.65	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	540/1434	4.22	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	475/1387	4.66	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	568/1386	4.56	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	506/1380	4.36	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	65/1193	4.83	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	619/1172	4.15	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	638/1182	4.34	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	798/1170	4.37	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	195/ 800	3.67	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 343 01
 Title History Of Animation
 Instructor: Worden,Frederic
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 118
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	13	19	4.43	695/1447	4.43	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	11	17	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	1	11	17	4.24	790/1241	4.24	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	14	14	4.25	608/1358	4.25	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1014/1316	3.73	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	4	8	19	4.48	486/1427	4.48	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	15	9	4.06	817/1434	4.06	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.06

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	23	4.59	684/1387	4.59	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	732/1387	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	9	21	4.52	597/1386	4.52	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	3	4	23	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	28	4.81	96/1193	4.81	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.81

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	1	4	3	8	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	2	6	10	4.10	832/1182	4.10	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	624/1170	4.45	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	15	19	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 26	Graduate 0	Major 28
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 35	Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 2			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 1	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ART 345 01
 Title Film II:Sound & Image
 Instructor: Cook,Cathy
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 119
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	891/1402	4.13	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	0	3	3.56	1147/1358	3.56	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1240/1316	3.17	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	541/1427	4.44	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1321/1447	4.13	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	262/1434	4.63	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	811/1386	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.29	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1193	4.80	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1170	4.60	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ART 347 01
 Title Writing For Media Arts
 Instructor: Cook,Cathy
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 120
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	447/1447	4.58	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	745/1402	4.27	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	980/1358	3.82	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	265/1316	4.64	3.62	4.14	4.13	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	582/1427	4.42	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	941/1387	4.36	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	758/1387	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	568/1386	4.55	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	506/1380	4.64	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	65/1193	4.90	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	309/1172	4.63	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 361 01
 Title Digital Darkroom
 Instructor: Peters,Christop
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 121
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	790/1447	4.33	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	448/1402	4.55	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1291/1358	3.00	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1316	****	3.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1246/1427	3.55	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1052/1434	3.80	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1092/1387	4.18	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	758/1387	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1010/1386	4.09	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	840/1380	4.30	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	65/1193	4.90	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	660/1172	4.13	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	660/1182	4.38	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	508/1170	4.63	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 3
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 362 01
 Title Black & White Photogrph
 Instructor: Peregoy,Christo
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 122
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	0	14	4.53	562/1447	4.53	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	510/1447	4.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	5	0	4	3.25	1251/1358	3.25	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1316	****	3.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	850/1427	4.19	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	478/1434	4.38	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	1124/1387	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	748/1386	4.40	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	877/1380	4.27	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	309/1172	4.63	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	508/1170	4.63	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.22	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 17	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 366 01
 Title Documentary Photograph
 Instructor: Cazabon, Lynn
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 123
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	640/1447	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	702/1447	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	459/1402	4.54	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	761/1358	4.08	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	671/1316	4.20	3.62	4.14	4.13	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	620/1427	4.38	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	741/1387	4.55	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1107/1387	4.55	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	784/1386	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	791/1380	4.36	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1193	4.82	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	428/1172	4.44	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.89	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	335/ 800	4.25	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 368 01
 Title Digital Alternatives
 Instructor: Peregoy,Christo
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 124
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	662/1447	4.42	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	655/1402	4.36	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1057/1358	3.70	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	3.91	4.19	4.15	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1301/1447	4.17	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	668/1434	4.22	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1055/1387	4.60	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	224/1193	4.60	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 375 01
 Title Photo/Dig Proc In Prin
 Instructor: Custen, Calvin R
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 125
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	3.62	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1427	4.67	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	701/1434	4.20	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	171/1386	4.88	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	445/1172	4.43	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	621/1182	4.43	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	538/1170	4.57	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.22	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 8	Non-major 3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 382 01
 Title Intro Interactive Medi
 Instructor: Smith,Ryan
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 126
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1277/1447	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1323/1447	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	611/1241	4.72	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1264/1402	3.86	4.21	4.24	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	3	1	2.80	1325/1358	3.34	3.65	4.11	4.10	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	1	0	2.10	1308/1316	2.77	3.62	4.14	4.13	2.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	4	0	2.70	1382/1427	3.63	3.91	4.19	4.15	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	1392/1434	3.36	4.04	4.10	4.09	2.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1272/1387	4.18	4.39	4.46	4.44	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	5	1	0	2	2	2.50	1386/1387	3.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	2.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1328/1386	3.83	4.27	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1104/1380	4.28	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	652/1193	4.38	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1144/1172	3.19	4.08	4.15	4.24	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	723/1182	4.48	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.86	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ART 382 02
 Title Intro Interactive Medi
 Instructor: Smith,Ryan
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 127
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	169/1447	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1447	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	4.72	4.41	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	797/1402	3.86	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	931/1358	3.34	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	0	4	3.44	1156/1316	2.77	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	398/1427	3.63	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	849/1434	3.36	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	566/1387	4.18	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1099/1387	3.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	431/1386	3.83	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1380	4.28	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	131/1193	4.38	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	925/1172	3.19	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.48	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	4.86	4.35	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 9	Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 383 01
 Title Sound Design
 Instructor: Nohe, Timothy
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 128
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1447	4.65	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	315/1447	4.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.58	4.41	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1402	4.41	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	173/1358	3.71	3.65	4.11	4.10	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1316	5.00	3.62	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	283/1427	4.33	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1326/1447	4.16	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1434	4.70	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.39	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	829/1387	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1380	4.77	4.29	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1193	4.91	4.41	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.43	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1182	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	480/1170	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 10	Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 383 02
 Title Sound Design
 Instructor: Nohe, Timothy
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 129
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	375/1447	4.65	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	741/1447	4.53	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	844/1241	4.58	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	766/1402	4.41	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1335/1358	3.71	3.65	4.11	4.10	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1316	5.00	3.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	971/1427	4.33	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	1275/1447	4.16	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	315/1434	4.70	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	684/1387	4.79	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	316/1386	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	615/1380	4.77	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1193	4.91	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	619/1172	4.43	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	856/1182	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	798/1170	4.43	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 800	4.67	4.22	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.86	4.56	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.28	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 384 01
 Title Intro 3D Animation
 Instructor: Zuber,James R
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 130
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	133/1447	4.92	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.41	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	402/1402	4.58	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1125/1358	3.60	3.65	4.11	4.10	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	1	4	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	3.62	4.14	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	200/1427	4.75	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	117/1434	4.80	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	475/1387	4.73	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.92	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	353/1386	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.91	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	89/1193	4.83	4.41	4.02	4.05	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	648/1172	4.14	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	723/1182	4.29	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	538/1170	4.57	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 387 01
 Title Expression Time & Moti
 Instructor: Sheppard, Jenny
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 131
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	9	1	4	1	0	1.80	1447/1447	1.80	4.27	4.31	4.32	1.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	5	1	1	2.27	1440/1447	2.27	4.23	4.27	4.23	2.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	4	3	2	2	2.71	1385/1402	2.71	4.21	4.24	4.24	2.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	1	2	1	0	2.00	1352/1358	2.00	3.65	4.11	4.10	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	1	2	1	0	2.00	1310/1316	2.00	3.62	4.14	4.13	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	3	3	5	0	2	2.62	1395/1427	2.62	3.91	4.19	4.15	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	11	3	0	3.13	1440/1447	3.13	4.47	4.69	4.65	3.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	4	5	0	0	2.08	1424/1434	2.08	4.04	4.10	4.09	2.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	6	1	1	2.57	1374/1387	2.57	4.39	4.46	4.44	2.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1342/1387	3.87	4.70	4.73	4.71	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	5	2	2	2.80	1345/1386	2.80	4.27	4.32	4.30	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	5	2	0	2.20	1369/1380	2.20	4.29	4.32	4.32	2.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1022/1193	3.33	4.41	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	0	3	1	2.75	1138/1172	2.75	4.08	4.15	4.24	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1070/1170	3.50	4.35	4.38	4.49	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 390 01
 Title IRC Fellows Topics
 Instructor: McDonald,David
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 132
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1058/1447	3.67	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	766/1447	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	4.33	4.21	4.24	4.24	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1447	4.75	4.47	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	849/1434	3.25	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1387	3.58	4.39	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1320/1387	4.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1386	3.75	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1169/1380	3.04	4.29	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	813/1193	3.40	4.41	4.02	4.05	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.08	4.31	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	3.58	4.35	4.38	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.22	4.06	4.12	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 390 01
 Title IRC Fellows Topics
 Instructor: McDonald,David
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 133
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1369/1447	3.67	4.27	4.31	4.32	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1400/1447	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.23	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.91	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.47	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1407/1434	3.25	4.04	4.10	4.09	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1369/1387	3.58	4.39	4.46	4.44	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1320/1387	4.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1328/1386	3.75	4.27	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1363/1380	3.04	4.29	4.32	4.32	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.40	4.41	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	999/1172	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1078/1182	4.08	4.31	4.35	4.42	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1163/1170	3.58	4.35	4.38	4.49	2.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 423 01
 Title Art Since 1945
 Instructor: Jacob, Preminda
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 134
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	963/1447	4.15	4.27	4.31	4.43	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	692/1241	4.36	4.41	4.33	4.41	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.21	4.24	4.34	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	751/1358	4.09	3.65	4.11	4.15	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	681/1316	4.18	3.62	4.14	4.27	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	3	5	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	3.91	4.19	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1426/1447	3.67	4.47	4.69	4.72	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	712/1434	4.18	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	953/1386	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1003/1380	4.08	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	236/1193	4.58	4.41	4.02	4.00	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	366/ 800	4.20	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	133/1447	4.96	4.27	4.31	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1447	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	143/1402	4.75	4.21	4.24	4.34	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	78/1358	4.96	3.65	4.11	4.15	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	112/1316	4.75	3.62	4.14	4.27	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	200/1427	4.54	3.91	4.19	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.63	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.79	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	475/1387	4.86	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	241/1386	4.84	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.88	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.41	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	203/1172	4.81	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.31	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.35	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	150/ 800	4.15	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	4.79	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	4.86	4.56	4.80	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.71	4.41	4.59	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.71	4.42	4.55	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	13/ 64	4.90	4.28	4.09	4.43	4.90
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	4	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 429 03
 Title Seminar: Art Hist & The
 Instructor: Jacob, Preminda
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 136
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3								4	5

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.27	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	352/1447	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.75	4.21	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1358	4.96	3.65	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.75	3.62	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	680/1427	4.54	3.91	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1202/1447	4.63	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.79	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.39	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.84	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.88	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.41	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.81	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.31	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.35	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	612/ 800	4.15	4.22	4.06	4.19	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	5.00	4.79	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	5.00	4.86	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	5.00	4.71	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	5.00	4.71	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	4.90	4.28	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: ART 430 01
 Title Graphic Design VI
 Instructor: Re,Margaret A
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 137
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	331/1447	4.74	4.27	4.31	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	389/1447	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	249/1402	4.72	4.21	4.24	4.34	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	893/1358	3.93	3.65	4.11	4.15	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	221/1316	4.69	3.62	4.14	4.27	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	3.91	4.19	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1182/1447	4.37	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	712/1387	4.56	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	369/1387	4.94	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	405/1386	4.69	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	887/1380	4.25	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.41	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 18	Graduate	0	Major	18	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 2						

Course-Section: ART 431 01
 Title Graphic Design VII
 Instructor: Abraham, Guenet
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 138
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	654/1447	4.45	4.27	4.31	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	834/1447	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	1088/1402	3.89	4.21	4.24	4.34	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1358	****	3.65	4.11	4.15	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1316	****	3.62	4.14	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	1137/1427	3.81	3.91	4.19	4.20	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	1	4.05	1349/1447	4.05	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	623/1434	4.27	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	1	7	8	4.06	1160/1387	4.06	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	934/1387	4.71	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	997/1386	4.12	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	799/1380	4.35	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	921/1193	3.62	4.41	4.02	4.00	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	607/1172	4.21	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	803/1182	4.14	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	695/1170	4.36	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	335/ 800	4.25	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 18	Graduate	0	Major	19	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 4						

Course-Section: ART 484 01
 Title Advncd 3D Cmputr Anima
 Instructor: Bailey,Dan
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 139
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	145/1447	4.87	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.41	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	336/1402	4.64	4.21	4.24	4.34	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	736/1358	4.11	3.65	4.11	4.15	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	392/1316	4.50	3.62	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	763/1427	4.27	3.91	4.19	4.20	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	206/1434	4.69	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.69

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	577/1386	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	549/1380	4.60	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	112/1193	4.79	4.41	4.02	4.00	4.79

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	261/1172	4.70	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1170	4.70	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	4.22	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 1					

Course-Section: ART 488 01
 Title Adv Topics:Aim
 Instructor: Dyer, Eric
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 140
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1182/1447	3.88	4.27	4.31	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1241	****	4.41	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.21	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1336/1358	2.63	3.65	4.11	4.15	2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1316	****	3.62	4.14	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1219/1427	3.63	3.91	4.19	4.20	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1407/1447	3.88	4.47	4.69	4.72	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	855/1386	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	971/1380	4.14	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.41	4.02	4.00	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	580/1172	4.25	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	737/1182	4.25	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	763/1170	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ART 489 01
 Title Senior Projects
 Instructor: Durant, Mark R
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 141
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.12	4.27	4.31	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	4.34	4.21	4.24	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.17	3.91	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1361/1447	4.60	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	429/1387	4.42	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.87	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	4.37	4.29	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1193	4.60	4.41	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.44	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.60	4.35	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	4.13	4.22	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5	Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 489 02
 Title Senior Projects
 Instructor: Cook, Cathy
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 142
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	1058/1447	4.12	4.27	4.31	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	766/1447	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	807/1402	4.34	4.21	4.24	4.34	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.50	3.65	4.11	4.15	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	6	2	2	3.36	1188/1316	3.43	3.62	4.14	4.27	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	799/1427	4.17	3.91	4.19	4.20	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.60	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	941/1387	4.42	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.87	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	607/1386	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	615/1380	4.37	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	332/1193	4.60	4.41	4.02	4.00	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	487/1172	4.44	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	347/1182	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	576/1170	4.60	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	423/ 800	4.13	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1318/1447	4.12	4.27	4.31	4.43	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1344/1447	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.31	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1139/1402	4.34	4.21	4.24	4.34	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	799/1358	3.50	3.65	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1134/1316	3.43	3.62	4.14	4.27	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1325/1427	4.17	3.91	4.19	4.20	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.60	4.47	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	849/1434	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1118/1387	4.42	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.87	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1220/1386	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1226/1380	4.37	4.29	4.32	4.34	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	420/1193	4.60	4.41	4.02	4.00	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	648/1172	4.44	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	621/1182	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.49	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	745/1170	4.60	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	335/ 800	4.13	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.25
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ART 492 01
 Title Topics:Art Or Media II
 Instructor: Rosenberg,Jason
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 144
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1120/1402	3.83	4.21	4.24	4.34	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1358	****	3.65	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1378/1427	2.75	3.91	4.19	4.20	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.47	4.69	4.72	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1303/1380	3.20	4.29	4.32	4.34	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1193	4.80	4.41	4.02	4.00	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	4.31	4.35	4.49	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.35	4.38	4.51	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.27	4.31	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.41	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.21	4.24	4.29	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.65	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	549/1316	4.33	3.62	4.14	4.34	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	596/1427	4.40	3.91	4.19	4.25	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	600/1434	4.29	4.04	4.10	4.21	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.39	4.46	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	483/1386	4.63	4.27	4.32	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.29	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	478/1193	4.25	4.41	4.02	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1172	4.88	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	470/1182	4.63	4.31	4.35	4.46	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.35	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.22	4.06	4.10	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	43/ 66	4.57	4.79	4.58	4.71	4.57
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	38/ 62	4.71	4.86	4.56	4.69	4.71
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	36/ 58	4.43	4.71	4.41	4.75	4.43
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	42/ 65	4.43	4.71	4.42	4.64	4.43
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	46/ 64	3.67	4.28	4.09	4.18	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	2.25	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.25	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 3	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0				
				I 0	Other 0			
				? 2				